

### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested wherein Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 have been canceled from the application.

As an initial matter, the specification stands objected to for failing to include a proper description of the elements designated by reference numbers 51-55. In particular, the Examiner alleges that these elements are merely described as "signal lines" without any indication of what signal or signals would be carried by each respective line. However, the signal lines are adequately described in paragraph [0023] of the specification. In particular, it is described that the gas turbine system is provided with a plurality of measuring points that enable the monitoring of the operating states or parameters and regulation of the gas-turbo set during operation. The measuring signals are gathered in a central control mode 50. An example of these signal lines are 51, 52, 53, 54 and 55. Therefore, Applicants submit that there is adequate description of the signal lines 51-55. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,470,688 to *Blatter et al.* Claims 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Blatter et al.* Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Blatter et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,214,435 to *Campbell*. Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Blatter et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,955,191 to *Okamoto et al.*

A disclosed embodiment in the present invention pertains to a method of operating a premix burner and a gas turbine. A gas turbine power output is

measured. A fuel quantity is introduced through the burner. A water quantity is introduced into one of the burner or the burner reaction zone. The water quantity is adjusted depending on the gas turbine power output. The water quantity is limited to less than 20 percent of the fuel quantity. These features are defined in independent Claim 2. None of the art of record describes these patentable features.

In contrast, *Blatter et al.* discloses supplying an additional working medium at the same time a fuel mass flow is supplied through the turbine, but makes no mention of limiting the water quantity to 20 percent of the fuel quantity. The Examiner seeks to rely on Figures 2 and 3 for disclosing this feature. However, there is no indication in either Figures 2 or 3 that the quantities listed are scaled to each other. There is absolutely no indication as to whether the shown relative water quantities and relative fuel quantities represent comparable values. In the same diagrams, graphs for the power output and the temperature are shown. Those values can clearly not be compared to a mass flow graph. As such, the values for the different graphs shown in Figures 2 and 3 are not comparable to each other. The only conclusion which can be made from the diagrams is the course of a relative water mass flow and a relative fuel mass flow over time. No conclusion can be made as to the water quantity related to the fuel quantity.

However, even if the mass flow graph shown in Figures 1-3 of *Blatter et al.* represent comparable values, there is still no indication of limiting the water quantity to less than 20 percent of the fuel quantity. Taking actual measurements in the diagrams indicates that the water quantity is a one centimeter, whereas the fuel quantity is at 4.5 to 4.6 centimeters. Thus, even if the graphs were on a comparable absolute scale, *Blatter et al.* would clearly disclose water quantities exceeding 20

percent of the fuel quantity. Therefore, *Blatter et al.* fails to disclose the patentable features of independent Claim 2.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the method of independent Claim 2, the claims depending therefrom, it is patentably distinguishable over the applied document. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner believe a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that she be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 8, 2004

By: Elaine P. Spector  
Elaine P. Spector  
Registration No. 40,116

P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404  
(703) 836-6620